THE MILITANT

Published Twice a Month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

VOL. III. No. 33 | NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 15, 1930. | PRICE 5 CENTS

The Plot Against the Soviets

Stalin Imprisoned the Opposition Bolsheviks and Allowed the Counter-Revolutionists to Get Into Positions of Power

Every worker conscious of his class interests must be profoundly alarmed at the exposure just made of the international conspiracy to overthrow the Soviet government. With a dramatic sharpness, it snatches out of the realm of abstraction the cold facts of the inexorable hostility of the capitalist world to the workers' republic. It makes real and living the fact of the permanent state of war—open or concealed—that exists between the power of the proletariat and the power of the bourgeoisie. Contrary to the soothing theories which have been expressed even in the ranks of the Communist movement, the Soviet state cannot live peacefully by the side of the imperialist states: either the one or the other must be overthrown.

The "Denials" of the Plotters

The statements made by the Soviets, charging the existence of an international plot that involves the imperialist masters of half a dozen countries and hundreds of counter-revolutionary elements in the Soviet Union, cannot be taken lightly, or considered as a a pssing sensatio.n Only those completely out of their senses would make such charges involving such "respectable" names as Poincare, Briand, Churchill, Deterding, and the rulers of Poland, Finland and Roumania unless there were substantial evidence to prove them.

We do not, of course, give a fig for the "indignant denials" of these imperialist bandits. Have not a Churchill, Lloyd George, Poincare, Pilsudski, and all the others, spent millions upon millions of dollars, and thousands of working class lives, in previous attempts to overthrow the workers' republic by armed force? Can anybody, except one without a memory, forget the military intervention in Russia of all the imperialist powers after the end of the world war, an intervention conducted on a dozen fronts? Can anybody forget the millions given to the Georgian Mensheviks, to Denikin, Wrangel, Yudenitch, Tchaikovsky, Koltchak, to the Social Revolutionists, to monarchists?

Why should any sane man put any credence in the "denials" of the conspirators? There is no reason at all. It may be that this or that individual named in the charges—based on the confessions of arrested Russian conspirators—cannot have his connection proved, but the fact remains that international capitalism is constantly seeking to overthrow the Soviet government and to support those elements within the Soviet Union who represent the interests of the capitalist class.

The conspiracy has no accidental or passing significance. It is a symptom of a deeply-rooted evolution in the relationship of forces in the Soviet Union. How does it happen that thirteen years after the establishment of the Soviet power, there should be uncovered a well-knit counter-revolutionary organization of some 2,000 people, many, if not most of them, of prominence? They are people who did not become counter-revolutionists yesterday. Many of them have been in the Soviet apparatus for years. Their origin was known, their past recorded: ex-czarist officers, technicians, manufacturers, nobles, Mensheviks, Cadets, etc., etc. How were these types able to reach such high posts in the Soviet apparatus, and perfect a centralized organization which converted into an actuality the possibility of a counter-revolutionary overthrow of the workers' dictatorship? They could not have started yesterday—such an organization must have required a few years; where was the G. P. U. in the past, where was the proletariat's secret service to unearth these people and bring them to proletarian justice?

It was too busy framing up Left Oppositionists with the aid of provocateurs and "Wrangel officers"—as may yet be done in the present case—to pay attention to the growing danger of counter-revolutionary gangs.

We must answer flatly and openly: The responsibility for this development lies principally upon the present Stalin regime in the Communist Party and upon the Stalin-Bucharin regime that preceded it! The credit for exposing these counter-revolutionary nests lies principally with the Left Opposition, the Bolshevik-Leninists!

The Opposition's Warning

For years past, the Opposition raised the cry of warning against the "Thermidorian danger," that is, the dangerous growth of those capitalist elements in the country, who were even pressing down upon the party, and whose aim was to undermine the proletarian dictatorship—in other words, the counter-revolutionary danger embodied in the kulaks, the Nepman, the bourgeois "specialists", the concessionary, and the Right wing inside the Communist Party. For this warning, the Stalinists and the Bucharinists slandered the Opposition. They denied the Thermidorian danger. They shouted down the Opposition as "alarmists" and people who "speculate on the overthrow of the dictatorship." The Fosters and Lovestones in this and every other country still attack the Opposition for its warning against the Thermidorian threat to Russia. While these epigones centered their attack upon the Left flank of the movement, the Right flank, the counter-revolution took the opportunity to perfect its sinister plans.

The strategy of the counter-revolution was and is: First, we crush the Left Opositios, the proletarian heart of the dictatorship—then comes our day. The club with which to do the crushing was the usurpatory faction of Stalin-Bucharin. A thousand facts prove this.

Among the main leaders of the conspiracy is the chief of the socalled Peasants' Party, Kondratiev, now imprisoned. Almost three years to the day before his arrest by the G. P. U. comrade Trotsky spoke before the Party Central Committee (October 23, 1927) on the proposal by Stalin-Bucharin-and-Co. to exclude him from that body:

> ". . . The thoroughly opportunist faction which has dragged behind it in recent years and still drags behind it. the Chiang Kai-Sheks, the Feng Yuhsiangs, the Wang Chin Weis, the Purcells, the Hickses, the Ben Tilletts, the Martinovs, the **KONDRATIEVS** and the Ustrialovs, this faction cannot tolerate us in the Central Committee, not even one month before the Congress. We know why."

In a dozen other speeches and articles, Trotsky warned against the Kondratievs by name and by species. **The Kondratievs were kept in the apparatus where they plotted the overthrow of the dictatorship; the Oppositionists who fought them were sent to prison or exile.**

Among others arrested in the plot are people like Ramzin, who was nothing less than Fuel Power Director, and Kalinnikov, a commander of the Central Military Academy. How did these two, and countless others reach these high posts, of such immense strategical value to the Soviet power? What Oppositionist was removed, expelled, imprisoned, exiled or killed, in order to make room for the Ramzins and the Kalinnikovs? Did the latter take the places of comrades Ocñotnikov, Kuzmitchev, Broidta and Capel, to mention only a few of the Oppositionists—valorous fighters in the civil war and some decorated with the Order of the Red Flag—who were expelled from the Military Academy and the Academy of Aviation?

It is an incontestable fact, which all the rabid howls of the Stalinist penman will not succeed in shouting down, that the ruling clique in the Party was too busy hounding the Opposition to notice the silent advance of the counter-revolution:

The Stalin-Bucharin regime tortured

Continued on page 3

For a Genuine United Front of the Millinery Workers

On Saturday, November 8, the Communist Party leaders gained another one of their customary "victories" in what was a horrible example of how a united front should be organized. The weeks of hard work by leading Left wing militants in the millinery industry in New York, who sought to find a common working basis in one of the most advantageous situations the Left wing has had for a long time, were nullified by the Party strategists with the mechanical, wrecking policies for which they have become notorious.

The Origin of the Movement

A few weeks ago, a group of operators, members of Local 24 of the A. F. of L. millinery union, who had found it impossible for the last few years to be part of the official Left wing in view of the prevailing Party policies, decided that the situation created by the threatened imposition of a "collective agreement" necessitated finding a working basis.

The millinery workers recall what the workings of a collective agreement mean to their standards. Up to a few years ago, such an agreement prevailed in the trade and all the workers remember its effects well. Now it is being proposed again. Zaritsky and the other Right wing union bureaucrats have been peddling about this proposal for a collective agreement as a means of "stabilizing the trade." They have pointed out to the manufacturers that it would put to a stop to the "hold-up tactics" of Local 42, the blockers, which has succeeding in raising working standards and wages to a fair extent. To accept the agreement would mean a general cutting of wages, a re-introduction and extension of piece work among the operators, the eventual increasing of working hours, and above all, the weakening of the safeguard of job control by "reorganization," which really means to furnish the bureaucrats and manufacturers with a weapon for discrimination.

Naturally, this situation aroused the spirit of the operators and blockers immediately. Resistance to the impending agreement was shown right away. It was expressed by the awakening of a movement among the operators, whose leading and most militant section organized as a Left wing group. This group approached and collaborated with the Left wing group that had already been workng and fighting in Blockers' Local 42 for some time in the past.

Then the group proceeded to negotiate with the official Left wing in the Industrial Union, which in essence means the Party. Endless discussion meetings were held, with the basis for discussion furnished by the need of working within the existing unions. After a number of deliberations, it was finally decided to call a joint meeting, consisting of all Left wing millinery workers, and the headgear department of the Needle Trades Workers I. U., to open up the question. The fact that the Stalinists consented to meet with militants in the old unions (who are theoretically "social fascists") is an indication of how the facts of the struggle compelled them to retreat from their untenable position.

The joint meeting, held three weeks ago, had a discussion of seven long hours during the Party's trade union position was riddled with holes. The "company union" theory and the rest of the stock in trade of the "third period" were conclusively revealed as false and unreal. The idea of coming before the 40 percent of the workers organized in the A. F. of L. union with the cry that the union they built up by struggle is a "company union", which must be left immediately—leaving the mass of the workers at the mercy of the bureaucracy—was shown to be quite untenable.

The Committee of Seven

After a series of manuevers, a committee of seven was finally elected from the floor. It was shown that a really democratic committee selection was impossible at this meeting, composed of about 150 workers, 75-80 of whom were Party members, representing only themselves, and bound in advance by decisions they had little part in making, while the others represented the overwhelming sentiment of the union under the stress of an impending collective agrement and a lockout

The lockout threatened by the bosses for November 15, and the need of crystallizing the resistance of the workers, made it necessary for this committee to meet immediately to decide on a course of action. But there was a delay of almost two weeks, caused by the fact that the broad Left wing group had been meeting regularly and formulated the proposal to issue a program and call a meeting at a certain date regardless of the Party's stand. One day later, a meeting was called of the enlarged committee together with the trade committee of the Industrial Union, where, after another exhaustive discussion, the resolution submitted by the broad Left wing was accepted by the Party to be presented at an enlarged meeting on November 8.

The long-delayed meeting finally opened on that day. It appeared as if it were possible finally to create a unified basis for work in the reactionary unions, with the joint efforts of all Left wing militants, regardless of their political or factional affiliations. The resolution was presented, it having been understood that it was to be the only matter discussed. Suddenly Sonia Croll, organizer of the headgear department of the N. T. W. I. U., came forward, made a long, puerile analysis of the trade (an insult to a worker's intelligence), and re-stated the catechism: the existing unions are company unions; they must be smashed; the collective agreement will be put over anyway; that will convince the millinery workers of the futility of

Continued on page 2

CONVERT CHRISTMAS TIME INTO MILITANT TIME

Collect for the Sustaining Fund

BUY A COUPON — SELL A COUPON

Get your friends and shopmates to

BUY A COUPON — SELL A COUPON

Are Walker and Lewis Going to Unite? ILLINOIS MINERS Howat and the Rank and File Movement

By JOSEPH ANGELO

SPRINGFIELD—

Besides injunctions and more injunctions, court-room battles, street bouts, gun duels, slugging one another and local strikes among the Illinois miners, the most striking development is the various maneuvers of John Walker, the secretary-treasurer of the re-organized Miners Union. Like all self-seeking labor fakers, but more notoriously, Walker is dabbling and kowtowing with the most anti-union element of Illinois. Whether it is an American Legion banquet, a Chamber of Commerce meeting, Rotary Club dinner or some boss' political rally Walker is always conspicious with his two large feet telling them what a great "labor leader" he is and how he has sacrificed and sacrificed and sacrificed for the Miners Union. The Miners call him "Weeping Jack." But there is a reason behind all of Walker's weeping. Walker has played the labor politician's game all his life and he still hopes to become a national figure.

It is only a few days ago that John Walker issued a statement to the American Federation of Labor convention at Boston, which read in part as follows:

"We will be glad to have the American Federation of Labor take any action that has for its purpose the bringing about a **conference of the officials of both organizations to arrange for calling of a convention."** (My emphasis).

Had the miners who are footing up the bills for the injunctions, lawyers and court costs anything to say about this statement? Is there any provision in the statement to have rank and file representented at the conference? Not at all. Everything is to be done by the officials of both organizations who have been hiring gunmen, fists and throwing verbal dynamite at each other for the last two years.

The Bureaucrats Unite

But Walker's statement is not the first time that this unity proposition sprouted out. During the recent Illinois Federation of Labor convention at Springfield, there were several locals of the re-organized Miners Union that sent delegates. When the question of seating these delegates came on the floor of the convention, Secretary Olander made the following announcement: "We came to an agreement with all parties involved not to seat the delegates from the re-organized locals of the Miners Union. We have done it so as not to create any bad feelings among those concerned. Because we hope to have both factions back with us in the near future." This was accepted by the delegates and even such "dead warriors" like John Hindmarsh who was a delegate from the re-organized union did not make a protest. Walker still had support in the Illinois Federation of Labor convention after the unseating of the miners delegates and if he were sincere in exposing John L. Lewis, this would have been a good time and place to do it. But, no, this could not be done or as Olander said, there had been an agreement reached.

Walker reads the handwriting on the wall. And that is why he is so active at the present time. He is playing a triple game. First, in case the miners put the boot to him, he will readily find a soft spot to land in the camp of the bosses. Second, trying in spite of everything, to become the outstanding miners leader and an "angel of peace" with the hope of becoming international president in place of Lewis and Howat at the fakers' unity convention. Third, he is running for the presidency of Illinois district, for which he not only has his flunkies busy working trying to capture the majority of the nominations to get at the head of the ballot, but also has the support of the Peabody Coal Co. mine guards: As for instance, in the Taylorville district where a Peabody mine guard walked into the local union meeting, put his gun on the table and told the members to nominate Walker for district president.

In the Miners' Rank and File

Will the rank and file miners agree to unity with the two sets of labor fakers or have John Walker for president of the re-organized Miners Union? The answer lies in which way the rank and file is moving and the situation on the Illinois mining fields.

In the Duquoin district the miners are working under the protection of mine guards, deputies and State Police. There one faction is trying to prevent the other faction from working. In Danville a similar situation prevails. Are the miners really doing this because they think that one faction is better than another? Not exactly. It is true that there are several local leaders that are bought and bribed by the one or the other faction and these flunkeys are doing the bidding of their pay-masters. The rank and file miners see no hope in either faction and at the present time they are supporting the lesser of the two evils and wait for the opportune moment to rid themselves of both evils.

In the meantime the coal operators are reaping the harvest. Speed-ups, loading-machines, wages-cuts and worsening of conditions are the order of the day. In the Taylorville district, the Peabody mines are being guarded day and night by a hord of company gunmen, machine gun are being brought to the mine property and each miner is carefully scrutinized as he comes to work every day. (That is, every day the mine works, which is very few). There is no strike here, all belong to one faction. The coal-operators here are preparing more wage-cuts, because they think that they can use one faction against the other when the time comes.

Can Walker and Lewis unite the division in camp by any of their methods? The struggle has gone too far and the wounds too deep and now the whole struggle has simmered down to a fight against both officialdoms and only the rank and file movement can heal the wounds and unite the union.

The Position of Howat

What is the position of Alex Howat in regards to the present struggle? The Fishwick-Walkers and the remnants of Farrington are in complete control of the re-organized Miners Union at the present time. Due to the international constitution adopted at the Springfield convention the whole power of the international executive board lies in the hand of the district presidents. That is, the district presidents have one vote for each two thousands members. Thus, altho Fishwick is district president and Howat international president, Fishwick has twenty votes, to Howat's one. Howat still has the respect and confidence of the rank and file. The mass meetings of Howat's are attended by thousands of miners. At these meetings Howat has urged the necessity of militant policies, the election of rank and file officials, the reinstatment of all those expelled, unemployment insurance and a Labor Party.

At the Mt. Olive memorial meeting on October 11th, Howat replied to the unity compromise of Walker's by saying, "The re-organized Miners Union is more determined than ever to continue its fight against Lewis and his organization. The Lewis wing is a company union and a tool of the coal operators. If the coal operators asked Lewis for anything, they usually got it. Instead of begging from the bosses, the miners must organize a strong militant union." And in reply to one of Fihwick's attorneys that spoke at the meeting who told of what great suffering and sacrifices that Walker, Fishwick and Nesbit went thru, Howat said, "that it was not the officials that did the suffering and sacrificing. They were well paid for what they did. But it was the rank and file that did all the suffering and sacrificing and paying." The coming few months will again test Howat. The crack in the policies will either widen or close. Howat will either have to support the policy of the rank and file in deeds and not words, or the present officialdom. Howat must choose: either the Left wing miners and an open, clear fight on their side; or drifting along at the tail end of the Fishwick kite, and serving to cover up the faults of the "new union's" reactionary leadership. But regardless of where Howat chooses to go, the Left wing must rely on the miner's ranks.

In this whole struggle there is one hopeful spark and that is the development of the rank and file "educational bodies." The first educational body was formed at Staunton. Since then it has spread to Herrin, Pana and Springfield. They have adopted a broad militant policy, uniting the progresive miners in both the Lewis and Fishwick union and carrying on educational work in both of the unions. Walker and Fishwick have already declared this a dual movement. These bodies are a healthy sign and they can be looked upon to play a big role in the future affairs of the Miners Union. They have already an important power, which is increasing right along. These rank and file movements are the cause of Walker and Lewis losing sleep and holding secret unity conferences. Will history repeat itself and Lewis and Walker unite as Lewis and Farrington did several years ago? The rank and file has other plans—plans which will put the Walkers, Lewises and others that go along with them where they rightfully belong.

In this whole gigantic struggle, where is the Stalinist Communist Party leadership? After all their glittering schemes, grand programs without ways and means for their accomplishment and wild plunges into ill-considered efforts, the "third period" chiefs enthusiastically greeted the miners by their absence. To-day, there is not a single Party unit functioning and Diogenes would need to look with a powerful microscope to find an active Stalinist.

It is due to the program and sober tactics of the Left Opposition that there is an awakening among the militant miners and a realization of the need for careful and substantial organizing of the Left wing in both of the Lewis and Fishwick unions and cutting a direct road past both officialdoms.

Millinery Workers Need Real United Front

Continued from page 1

fighting within the existing union!

The representatives of the broad Left wing group were once more compelled to speak. For hours they again argued against the false analysis and conclusions of the Indutrial Union leaders on the subject of the socalled "company unions." But all to no avail. The Party decision had already been made. A phoney resolution was presented by the Party spokesman, and before any discussion could be had, it was jammed through with the aid of the Party's "packing." The resolution called for a committee to determine (after the weeks of discussion and work!) the nature of our work. The Left wing militants, not under Party discipline, refused to participate in this burlesque of a united front, and one by one declined membership on the committee. Thirteen Party and I. U. members were chosen, and thus ended the "united front" which is now being so widely advertised. No "social fascists," Lovestoneites, Trotskyites, or other non-kosher elements are to "contaminate" the committee.

Party's Arbitrariness

The whole situation spoke loudly of the fact that there is enormous vitality for the Left wing movement, and opportunities for real work. The Left wing workers in the main, understand the need of working unitedly with the whole Left wing movement and with the Party. They made every effort to work together so that prestige and strength would accrue to the Left wing and Communist movement. It was they who approached the Party, and sought united action. All the Party saw in this was a chance to "put something over."

The views of these militants, with years of experience in Left wing struggles, many of them former members of the T. U. E. L., men with standing among the workers, were coolly disregarded by the Party leaders, who thought to "rope them in," so to speak, by the cheap method of getting a mechanical majority in a packed meeting. The weeks of hard work merely demonstrated that the Party leaders will not yield from their untenable position, no matter what the requirements of the situation may be. "Either our line, or nothing."

Nevertheless, it would be a big mistake to stop the work begun by these militants, which was temporarily sidetracked by Party tactics. The position they took at the beginning remains sound: Work in the existing unions, collaborate with the organized Left wing, for unity of all the militants. The attempts by certain Lovestoneite elements to find an "easy road" for this movement by cutting it away from the official Left wing, have met with healthy and justified resistance from these militants who will not fight against the Communist movement but will help to redress its line and the line of the Left wing.

These workers are not taken in by the "simplified" Party theory of "company unions, which breeds passivity, sectarianism and defeatism. They are for a Left wing policy that will win the workers.

Organize the Left Wing!

The alternatives are not limited to either subjugation to the Party's false line, or no Left wing work at all. The Communist movement can and does transcend the stifling bounds of the Stalinist bureaucracy and Left wing militants can organize their work, and fight, without this bureaucracy if needs be, so long as they retain their contract with the bulk of the Left wing movement. The work of Left wing blockers in Local 42 amply illustrates that real work can be carried on in spite of Party muddling.

The urgent need now is that, on the basis of these experiences, there should be crytallized a broad Left wing movement, including all the militants in the industry for a struggle against the union bureaucracy, their capitalist masters, their class collaboration practises and theories, and for a class struggle policy and the unification of all the millinery workers. The immensity of the task demands bold and determined action. —S. M. ROSE.

New Seamen's «International»

HAMBURG—

There has just been held here a supposed International Seamen's and Dockers' Conference, and we are told that delegates present represented nearly half a million workers. After a lot of revolutionary talk it was decided to set up a revolutionary international of seamen and dockers.

Now we will all agree that such an international is wanted, but any one in close touch with the above conference will have arrived at only one conclusion, and that is, a real international of seamen and dockers can ony be brought about by a conference of representatives from bona fide seamen and dockers organizations and not by a meeting of a few paid functionaries of the Communist Party, seamen's clubs and dockers' group.

At the above conference it was claimed that representatives were present from Germany, Britain, France, U. S. A., China, South America, etc., etc. One seemed to find it difficult, however, to discover what organizations they represented. Why all this mystery when five hundred thousand workers were represented, I don't know.

The star turn at the conference was the notorious George Hardy, who long ago became a back number in the States. We next hear of him as a big noise in the Minority Movement in Britain, but he ultimately suffered the same fate there. During the 1925 seamen's strike, Hardy tried to call it off in London while the samen were still on strike in Australia. And it's a good job for George, but a bad job for the movement, that the seaman didn't get hold of him, otherwise they would have dumped him in the dock.

Another interesting chapter in Hardy's history is his connection with the general strike in England. During the whole period of this strike, although he was the organizing secretary of the Minority Movement, George couldn't be found. (He was probably too busy fraternizing with Messrs. Purcell, Swales and Co. in the Anglo-Russian "Unity" Committee!—Ed.)

It was following this episode that Hardy was given the order of the boot. He now turns up here in Hamburg as the president of the seamen's and Dockers' International. As delegates were present at this conference from the U. S. A., it would be interesting to learn what seamen's and dockers' organization they represented and what voting power they carried numerically. RED SEAMAN.

If the number on your wrapper is

58

then your subscription to the **Militant** has expired. Renew immediately in order to avoid missing any issues.

THE MILITANT Vol. III. No. 33, Nov. 15, 1930. Published twice monthly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y. Subscription rate: $2.00 per year; foreign $2.50. Five cent per copy. Bundle rates 3 cents per copy. Editorial Board: Martin Abern, James P. Cannon Max Shachtman, Maurice Spector, Arne Swabeck. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879 (Total No. 58)

The Big Efficiency Union

The Benefits of Hillmanism

By ALBERT ORLAND

Since the Amalgamated Clothing Workers embarked on the policy of class collaboration, a great change has taken place in the organizational and social outlook of that once radical labor union. From an organization whose chief concern was the well-being of its membership and whose social guide was the principle of the solidarity of labor, the A. C. W. has been transformed into an agency for the promotion of rationalization in the clothing industry, with the workers being the victims of all the concomitants of capitalist rationalization.

Militant Collaboration

The leadership of the Amaglamated has been selling this sort of unionism to all: manufacturers, workers and the "public." All are welcome to share in its benefits, and, we are assured, all are anxious to avail themselves of the opportunity whereever it has been given them by the generous hand of the A. C. W. leadership. Those who oppose the protection and the benefits of Amalgamated control, as we are enlightened, are either stupid or incorrigible fanatics and dogmatists. Not only have Hillman and his associates displayed sufficient courage and agressiveness in following the line of class collaboration policy, but they have given it widespread publication as the last word in trade unionism. The A. C. W. has for years promulgated this policy in its official organs, giving numerous demonstrations of its workings and even taking pride in its achievements.

What is the essence of this Amalgamated "new unionism?" Who has benefited by it, and what are the real conditions of the Amalgamated members in the shops and out of the shops, as a result of the application of the new policy? Let us analyze this policy and look into the facts.

The principle of union-employers cooperation is not new. It has been advocated and practiced by all reformist unions. It consists of the recognition of the common interests of capital and labor and of the necessity of cooperation for the common benefit of both.

The A. C. W. leadership has not introduced any new elements into this conception to justify its claims to being the most "advanced" trade union in the labor movement. It has, however, proved able to camouflage this policy of class collaboration with such names as the "new strategy", "militant unionism", realistic militant unionism", etc., and for that it certainly deserves credit and admiration as no other trade union in the country.

In practice, the A. C. W. policy expresses itself in the following manner: The union and the employers cooperate in reducing labor costs by increasing production, eliminating waste, applying efficient methods, eliminating strikes and promoting peaceful relations between both parties. The workers are to receive the benefits of increased production in the form of union wages and hours.

What the Bosses Want

Any clear-minded person will easily understand that employers do not need the cooperation of a labor union in the rationalization of their enterprises, that technical management can be procured outside of trade union offices and that non-union shops are no less concerned about efficient methods of production than union shops. What an employer can, however, expect from a labor union is cooperation in eliminating strikes and securing uninterrupted production.

The A. C. W. entered the field of rendering that kind of service to the clothing manufacturers and has proved able to measure up to its task. It has even gone further than that. It has offered them the services of all the resources of the organization, cooperation in the shops by efficiency experts it maintains, credits from its banks in addition to guarantees of peace and uninterrupted production. The A. C. W. boastfully claims to have put the union shops in an advantageous position in comparison with non-union shops in regard to competition, that it has actually made the open shop a non-paying proposition for employers.

Hillman, surely, cannot be denied recognition for accomplishing these ends. In fact, he has been compensated for his achievements by high praise from all sorts of patriotic and reformist quarters and was even accorded medals for his contributions to the cause of social peace. But what benefits have the workers in the clothing industry received in return for their cooperation? What has rationalization given them and what are their prospects?

Thousands of Amalgamated members have been thrown out into the streets, replaced by machinery or eliminated as "waste in industry" by A. C. W. efficiency experts. They are doomed to starvation, victims of Hillman's "militant efficiency unionism."

Is the A.C.W. officialdom aware of these facts? What are its answers to them? In **Advance,** official organ of the A. C. W., of March 14, 1930, we read from a speech delivered by an A. C. W. organizer at a conference of the Railway Clerks, the following reference to these facts:

"The policy of cooperation for efficiency meant the gradual elimination of the inefficient shops and with the dying out of these shops a good many people lost their employment temporarily. We were compelled to face that, and in the working out of the process the temporary hardships of the displacements have been compensated for a hundred fold in the tremendous improvements in wages and conditions that have been made possible in a more efficient industry."

Here is an open admission that the policy of cooperation is responsible for the great unemployment existing in the clothing industry. But the Amalgamated bureaucrat sidetracks this question by inserting the meaningless "temporarily" and making references to "tremendous improvements," apparently hoping in this manner to knock any possible critic off his feet.

What "Temporary" Means in the A. C. W.

But what has become of the "good many people who have lost their employment temporarily?" Have they been put back into the industry? Or were they eliminated "temporarily" until forced to drift into other occupations, or died of starvation? There was a case a few years ago with 150 cutters of the Chicago organization who were eliminated by the joint decision of the union and Hart, Schaffner and Marx for a compensation of $500 a piece, and eliminated **permanently** with admonitions never to come back because the industry did not need them any more. And the cutters were the aristocrats in the industry. This case can be characterized as the siren of "efficiency unionism." For what happened to the Chicago cutters a few years ago has since become a daily occurrence and a matter of routine in the clothing shops under Amalgamated control. Hundreds of cutters and thousands of workers from other branches have been eliminated without any compensation to face starvation and misery. There are today hundreds of "aristocrats" permanently unemployed in the New York market, members of the once powerful Cutters Local 4. The membership of this local has dwindled from 4,000 to 2,000, with more than one-third permanently unemployed.

Now how about the "tremendous improvements" in wages and conditions referred to by the A. C. W. organizer in his speech? Have the wage standards been raised or lowered as a result of the increased production? Are there any wage standards at all in A. C. W. shops outside of these fixed by the employers and sanctioned by the officials of the Amalgamated? Are there any price committees in the shops? And, by the way, why was it necessary to abolish the week-work system which has been so fiercely resisted by the workers and forced on them by the Beckermans and other agents of Hillman?

That the piece-work system has been forced on the workers as a scheme to increase the speed up and reduce wages is given testimony by the officialdom recently on the occasion of the introduction of piece-work in the Montreal market. In **Advance,** July 11, 1930, under the caption "News from Montreal" the following explanation is given by the Montreal officialdom:

"It has become increasingly important to give the manufacturers who are willing to stand by the union a fair chance to do business in competition with the 'illegitimate' (meaning the non-union) manufacturers. The prevailing system of week-work in the Montreal market has placed the inside bona-fide manufacturers at a disadvantage in comparison with the 'illegitimates'."

Hillman Gives the Bosses a Break!

The manufacturers are given a fair chance through the piece-work system to cut the wages to the level of the non-union workers in order to be able to compete with non-union shops. The increase in efficiency does not seem, at least in this case, to warrant any "tremendous improvements" in wages. One can even conclude from the above explanation that this "efficiency" is produced by the speed-up forced on the Amalgamated members by piece work and other schemes.

And how about the hours of work? Has the A. C. W. made any attempt to shorten the hours, a reform so imperative at the present tie and surely warranted by an efficient industry? Except for adopting resolutions at conventions, nothing has been attempted in that direction.

The "new, militant, realistic unionism" of the Amalgamated, when stripped of its attractive coverings, emerges as a genuine reactionary kind of union-employer cooperation, a boomerang to the workers. This "militant" unionism has in a few years wiped out all the gains the clothing workers had enjoyed in past years as a result of their struggles, it has ruined their lives and hopes. This "unionism" can only be maintained by force and deceit. Such a regime has been established and perfected by the Amalgamated bureaucracy.

Hillman boasts of his banks, cooperative apartment houses, and office buildings. The workers know that all these have been built on their sweat and blod, and enjoyed by manufacturers and union bureaucrats, while they suffer and starve. The day is not far off when the clothing workers will arise to action and radically change the leadership and the policies of the Amalgamated.

Rose Karsner Bus. Manager

At a recent meeting of the national committee of the League, comrade Rose Karsner was appointed to take over the business and financial management of the Militant. Comrade Karsner has had a wealth of experience in the movement and her work will be of great assistance to the stabilizing of our paper. Plans are already under way for conducting a campaign to insure the Militant and make it possible to return to a weekly status. As a first step in this work, an appeal has just been made to the branches to raise a small quota for an emergency. The response to the appeal—which is only little over a week—has been good: The Minneapolis comrades sent in $20.00; New York, $22.00; Toronto, $37.00; Chicago, $23.00; Boston, $5.00, and the others still to be heard from. We urge all our comrades and supporters to give the new manager the measure of cooperation that will make our further work secure.

"The Draft Program of the Communist International" by L. D. Trotsky is a thorough analysis of the principal theories animating the course pursued by the leadership of the International since 1923—the theory of socialism in one country and the question of the character of the revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial counries. The American edition is 35 cents a copy and can be bought from the Militant at 25 Third Avenue, New York City.

IN JEWISH

JUST RECEIVED FROM POLAND

My Life

By LEON TROTSKY

In Two Volumes of 700 Pages

Five Dollars for Both Volumes

Order from

THE MILITANT

25 Third Avenue . . . New York, N. Y.

The Anti-Soviet Plot

Continued from page 1

comrade Trotsky's secretary, Georgi Butov, to death, while Stalin's secretary was enabled to go abroad and turn White Guard.

The Stalinist regime stood comrade Jakob Blumkin against the wall and shot him—a dastardly crime they have never dared to defend publicly. Then Stalin oppointed Mr. Agabekov to Blumkin's post. Agabekov went abroad to join the army of the counter-revolution!

An accusation is now made against Briand, and justly. But in 1927, when the Briands demanded the withdrawal of comrade Christian Rakovsky as Soviet ambassador to France, because he had signed the Platform of the Opposition, Stalin and Bucharin withdrew Rakovsky. Who replaced the Rakovskys? Bessedovsky, who helped to expel Rakovsky in the Party nucleus! Bessedovsky, who fled through the back window of the Soviet Embassy in Paris to join the ranks of the enemies of the proletarian dictatorship!

In the United States, Serebriakov, (who later capitulated) was taken out of the Amtorg. His place was taken by the Delgasses. Delgass has now joined the counter-revolutionary hue and cry against the Soviets; he has become the darling of the New York White Guards.

The charges name Lord Churchill. They might have added the name of his colleague Chamberlain, who said England would recognize Russia only when Trotsky is stood against the wall and shot. Is there any difference **in essence** between that command, and the reality—the fact that comrade Trotsky was finally deported to Turkey; the fact that comrade Rakovsky is in mortal danger in Barnaoul, threatened with death by Stalin's refusal to transfer him to another climate; that Muralov, ex-military head of the Moscow district (what Kalinnikov took his place?), is desperately ill in Siberian deportation; that comrade Zinzadze wracked by tuberculosis, is kept in solitary exile; that hundreds and thousands of others are suffering the same fate?

We repeat that the Stalinist regime, with the whole state and party apparatus at its command, was so occupied with hounding and suppressing the Bolshevik Opposition as "agents of world imperialism", that the real agents of counter-revolution were enabled to mobilize the strength they have now been shown to have.

Stalin and the Right Wing

The Stalinist clique, which now admits that the conspirators were staking their cards on the victory of the Right wing (Bucharin-Rykov-Tomsky), was the intimate partner of this very same Right wing in the campaign to strangle the Bolshevik-Leninists. To the extent that this campaign was successful, it was a victory, not for the proletariat, but for the Kondratievs, the Ramzins, the Ustarialovs, the Chamberlains and world imperialism as a whole.

* * *

The capitalist press is making a sickly effort to minimize the whole plot. Naturally. They wish to lull the workers into a false security. But the vanguard will not be deceived. The Thermidorian danger, the danger of the growth of the counter-revolutionary forces, is a real one in the Soviet Union. Soviet Russia, isolated from the capitalist world, encircled by the might of world imperialism, still has a strong base for capitalist elements and capitalist restoration. The advances of the Soviet Union, while it liquidates some of these elements, sharpen the contradictions inherent in an isolated proletarian state and bring the restorationist dangers to a head. The Stalinist regime accentuates these dangers.

Oscillating between a proletarian line and a petty bourgeois line, Stalinism is unable to mobilize properly the international revolutionary resistance of the workers. This task, now more imperative than ever in the face of the recent exposures, requires a Leninist course, a Leninist regime in the Party, a Leninist policy towards the proletariat at home and towards the international movemnt. It requires a Leninist leadership. This leadership is dispered, in prison and exile. It must be recalled and reinstated.

The counter-revolution has raised its ominous head. The Bolsheviks, the fighters and leaders of the October revolution, are needed in the Party to crush the threat to the Soviet Union and the international revolution. —S-n.

The A. F. of L. Convention and the November Election

By MAX SHACHTMAN

Two recent evente, seperated by less than a month, furnish us with aspects in different fields of the position of the American working class. They are the "golden jubilee" convention of the American Federation of Labor in Boston and the national elections just concluded.

The A. F. of L. Convention

It has become a commonplace to say of the former that it was "one of the most reactionary assemblages in its history." That trait, indeed, has come to be taken with an almost fatalistic certainty. The Boston convention did not seem to be illuminated with the faintest ray of light. The petty bourgeoisie and big bourgeoisie that dominated the A. F. of L. and its convention, its spokesmen who ranged from the principal executive of the American capitalist class, Hoover, to its scarcely concealed agent, Green, ruled the convention in dead-black serenity. The burning problems of the working class, crying out for solution, were either entirely ignored or else treated with a cold, dead hand.

Less than three out of the approximately forty millions of workers are organized into the A. F. of L. It is to the direct interests of the organized workers, and corresponds to the desire of the more conscious among them, to draw the other millions into the trade union movement, so that—even from the narrow standpoint of the trade unionist—the "bargaining power" of labor is increased. Two years ago, the New Orleans convention of the A. F. of L., walled in between the demand for organizing the unorganized that proceeded from within the unions and the work that was begun independently by the Left wing from the outside, issued the slogan of "double the membership," just as the Detroit convention before it issued the slogan of organizing the automobile industry. The history of this "campaign" is completed in two sentences: The Toronto convention repeated the "double the membership" slogan. The Boston convention tacitly attended the funeral where even its name was not mentioned. In place of the new forces from the immense reservoir of unorganized that has only to be tapped in order to flow torrentially, the convention had a new decline in membership to record.

Increasing millions of workers are unemployed in the country, suffering intense misery, starving in the golden storehouse of the world like Tantalus, surrounded by food and unable to avail himself of it. The debates on the subject of unemployment and relief were like the droning of monks cut off from the real world without. The only loud voices raised were those of the reactionaries who, like Green, considered it preferable for the workers to starve in the streets, than for them to want even that pitiful, bureaucratic social insurance that the liberals advocate as a sedative for social unrest. Thoughtful members of the captalist class —more concerned with their own interests, to be sure, than with relieving working class misery are looking with approval at some mild form of insurance, but not the hierarchy of the A. F. of L. Like the servile footman. the Greens are more concerned for the interests of their master than the master himself.

To bring out more distinctly the reactionary pall hanging over the convention, the "progressives" can be mentioned. Timid and pitiful though their bleating protests may have been—and they were worse than that—the manner in which even their supplicating and thoroughly respectful speeches and proposals were received (they might have been made in the arid deserts of Africa for all the attention they got in Boston) only emphasized the iron rule of the Greens, Lewises, Wolls and Hutchesons. And why should the barons of the A. F. of L. treat these people with less contempt? They occupy a miserable post akin to the Russian czar's "official Jew", the **hof Jude** who was kept at court to show that the emperor was not an anti-semite.

What the whole situation demanded from one with the pretentious title of "progressive" was a vigorous denunciation of the whole bureaucracy and its system i. e., of capitalism and those who serve it in the labor movement. But when the "progressives" bear names like Zaritsky, whose claim to trade union leadership rest principally upon collaboration with the hat manufacturers and persecution of the Left wing minorities in his union, it would be asking for too much.

Despite all these features, which combine to produce the even monotony of constantly deepening reaction at every year's convention, there are valuable aspects to this convention which crown the period that preceded it.

Labor's Dissatisfaction

A restlessness and discontentment is permeating the American working class. It is begnning to awaken from the luxuriant dream of the prosperity days. It is not only feeling the scourge of unemployment, but the radical lowering of its living standards in a dozen different forms: wage cuts, lengthening of the working day, intensification of labor, "stagger systems" and the like. Directing the hostility at the boss, it also commences to discern behind the capitalist government the hazy figure of the capitalist class. In a word, the premises are present for the development of a clear class consciousness among the workers.

The bureaucracy of the A. F. of L., and its whole conservative machinery, are pillars of American imperialism—more visible today than ever. Without them, the security of the ruling class would be considerably diminished. The function of the bureaucracy is to prevent the workers from understanding the class nature of the government. That this function is being exercised by Green and Co. with more energy today than for many years past, speaks loudly for their fear of an imminent awakening of the American workers as a class, the consummation of which would be a landmark in revolutionary progress.

Thirteen years ago, the capitalist class required the solid support of the working class for the imperialist slaughter. It needed the official labor movement as a bulwark against the Red menace presented by the militant socialist and I. W. W. opposition to the war. It therefore took the unusual step of sending Woodrow Wilson to an A. F. of L. convention to enlist labor. In 1930, it needs its docile acquiescence because the crisis is to be "solved' at the expense of the workers. It needs the A. F. of L. more than ever as a barricade against the new Red menace of the Communist movement. It therefore recurs to the unusual step of sending a president to give a public demonstration of the unity of the official labor movement and the capitalist government. Hoover's speaking at the Boston meeting was not a sign of the confidence the capitalist class feels, but of its uneasiness.

The A. F. of L. Decline

There is an even more interesting phase of the A. F. of L.'s development, which is quite without precedent. Since it was organized in 1881, it has reflected, with greater or lesser accuracy, the alternating periods of boom and crisis. With virtually no deviation, it increased its membership with every economic rise (1889, 1899-1903, 1905-1908, 1911, 1913. 1915-1920) and declined precipitately with every depression or crisis. The depression commencing in 1920, found it at its unrepeated height: 4,078,740 members. With the crisis it declined to 2,865,799 in 1924. But the period of prosperity that followed, absolutely unprecedented in modern times, far from resulting in a growth of membership, actually shows a persistent decline that has continued to this moment — throughout the prosperity, down to the present crisis! The decline continued at the Boston convention, for while a formal increase of 27,000 members was recorded both this "increase" and the real loss are accounted for by the calm report of the U. M. W. A., made by Lewis without batting an eyelash in which 400,000 members were claimed (when there are actually less than 100,000 miners in the Lewis union).

How is this record, which breaks with previous, allegedly "historical" precedents, to be explained?

American imperialism emerged from the war, from the post-war domestic crisis and the revolutionary crises of Europe, not only as a first-rate world power, but as **the** first world power. Its frenzied expansion after 1924 was an expansion beyond its boundaries. Its wealth and power rested, and still rests upon its dominant position in world economy. One may say that the relationhip of the international working class was to the American working class as a whole what the relationship of the unskilled American worker is to the American labor aristocrat. American imperialism was enabled—for the first time on such a scale—to sustain a broad labor aristocracy. The rise in the standard of living of this section of the workers, which counted millions in its ranks, was, so to speak, "granted without a struggle" by a bloated capitalist class. Unlike previous periods, labor's economic improvements were not squeezed out through the intermediary of the trade unions. With a "satisfied" working class at home, the fabulous super-profits extorted by American imperialism from the rest of the world, not only made these improvements possible but even profitable.

The Fall of the Strike Curve

This view is confirmed by the index of strike activities. Previous periods of prosperity and trade union growth have almost always been characterized by an increase in the number of strikes and strikers. The last period of prosperity and of improved workers' economic conditions showed a directly opposite process: strikes and strikers have been almost uninterruptedly on the decline not only from 1920 but from 1924. To use the figures of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, repeated recently by the Standard American Corporation, we get the following table (Strike column includes lookouts):

Year	Strikes	Involved
1919	3,630	4,160,348
1920	3,411	1,463,054
1921	2,385	1,099,247
1922	1,112	1,612,562
1923	1,553	756,584
1924	1,249	654,641
1925	1,301	428,416
1926	1,035	329,592
1927	734	349,434
1928	629	357,145
1929	903	230,463

The current year shows a still further decline (about 40 percent less than the 1929 figure for the same months). And the tremendous unemployment attendant upon the present crisis does not indicate any increase in strike activity for the period immediately ahead.

From all that has been said above, it does not at all follow that the outlook for the American working class is so uniformly dark. It is an establshed fact that, especially in our time, apparently fixed precedents are broken, that the slow arithmetical progression of the working class is frequently interrupted either by abrupt geometric leaps or by a retrogression. So far as the radicalization of the working class is concerned, the last half a decade has shown a retrogression on the whole. But this very past has prepared the grounds for a penetration of the revolutionary idea into the consciousness of the proletariat.

There is an enormous working class discontentment in the country. Thus far it is blind and mirdirected, that is, polically, it is safely canalized into the bourgeois parties this time the Democrats. The bulk of the working class voted against Hoover and his administration as the embodiment of the crisis and the unemployment. So rapidly do profound changes in economic and political life take place in our epoch, that it required only a brief two years to secure a repudiation of a government swept into power with the biggest vote on record. From 1928 to 1930, the turnover of votes amounted to upwards of 8,000,000 (the total of the Republican plurality in 1928 plus the Democratic plurality this year). Neither the Wilson administration but the disreputable Harding regime suffered so humiliating and rapid a defeat as did Hoover.

What About Radicalizaton

But this discontentment is not yet a radicalizaion of the working class. So far as the latter was expressed politically, it was done largely through the tiny vote of the Communist Party (a bare doubling of the still smaller "prosperity" vote in 1928), to which should be added, of course, many thousands of disfranchized workers. But the results of the elections, plus the statistics of strike struggle—the two principal indices of working class radicalization—are a smashing blow at the monstrouly exaggerated analyses of the Stalinists. Their contentions concerning the "mass upsurge of the American workers", the "widespread radicalization of the masses", "the workers following the Communist Party"—all these fall to the ground before the facts. To a moderate extent, the Left Opposition shared his error in the past. That is, it proceded from the indisputable fact that the **premises** exist for a deep-going radicalization of the workers and drew the conclusions that the process was well under way. Closer examination and recent developments indicate that **the pre-conditions for radicalization are even increasing, but the process is only at its elementary stage of development.**

At what tempo will it proceed? What will be the extent of its sweep? Where will it end? That depends not only a series of economic factors, but in larger degree than is usually conceived, upon the ability of the revolutionists to take advantage of the **premises** in order to accelerate the **process** of radicalization.

There is no law compelling the working class of America to repeat the experiences of its own past or those of the European working class, at any rate, not for the same length of time. We live, as we have remarked, in an epoch of convulsions, developing jerkily and unevenly, replete with the breaking of precedents. All "precedent" showed that in this election there should have a large "third party" which, like the Greenbackers, the People's Party, the Progressive Party and the Labor Party movement of seven-eight years ago, would arise fatally on the basis of an economic crisis. But this "law" was violated: there was no real sign of a "third party" in the present elections. The dissatisfaction of the masses was almost wholly absorbed by the Democratic Party.

For many historical reasons, the American working class is a very violent one, and at the same time the least class conscious. With the whole atmosphere favorable for a swift development of this consciousness, what is mainly needed to achieve it is a Communist Party capable of seeing at what turn we find ourselves, and steering for the right road. But the Party leaders, who are really only approaching this road, conduct the Party and its policies as though the road were not only reached but already half-way travelled over. That is why we have one smash-up after another under the leadership of the "third period" specialists who cannot distinguish tomorrow from yesterday or today, and take the beginning of a process for its conclusion.

What is needed is a bold leadership, not a foolhardy or foolish one, with policies based on realities and not fantasies. Such a leadership could liquidate the liquidators of the Right wing without great difficulties, for it would oppose to the latter's policies those Bolshevik policies that produce successes and not the defeats that the Right wing feeds upon. The Lovestone group, recovering from its grudging and partial support to the program of organizing the unorganized into industrial unions under the leadership of the Left wing, has become bold enough to raise the slogan "Back to the A. F. of L.!"—its "clever" way of proposing an end to this "foolish business" of the new unions. Without wasting time arguing with the Right wing over the need of winning—from within—the A. F. of L. workers (a need which we, at least, take for granted), the Communist movement must proceed with the consolidation of the new unions, which have a tremendous future and great vitality, and all the conditions for which still exist. It is hardly necessary to emphaside here that we do not withdraw a syllable of our criticism of the Stalinists who, by their conduct in the Left wing unions, have done incaluable harm to the new movement. But even they have been unable to destroy it or its possibilities.

The Place of the Left Opposition

What is needed is a leadership capable of strengthening the Party, not keeping it stagnant or weakening it. What the present Party leadership does is to broaden the base for reformism and not for revolution: that is, its policies help to alienate the awakening workers from Communism and to drive them into the socialist or syndicalist camp. Out of the present Party leadership, which is thorughly corrupted by Stalinism, no fundamental progress can be expected. That must proceed from the ranks of the Party and the Left wing around it, a process that the Left Opposition is helping to accelerate by building its own ranks and organizing the Bolshevik faction within the Party itself. Our struggle is inextricably bound up with the whole question of the path of the American working class, the question raised anew by the two events we have discussed: the revolutionary road or the reformist. Our victory is one guarantee that it will tread the former.

How Stalin-Bucharin Destroyed the Chinese Revolution

A LETTER BY TCHEN DU HSIU

Dear Comrades!

Since I followed our comrades to found the Chinese Communist Party, I sincerely executed the policy of opportunism of the international leaders, Stalin. Zinoviev. Bucharin and others making the Chinese revolution suffer a shameful and sad failure. Though I have worked night and day, yet my demerits exceed my merits. Of course, I should not imitate the hypocritical confessions of some of the ancient Chinese emperors: "I, one person, am responsible for all the sins of the people," take upon my own shoulders all the mistakes that caused the failure. Nevertheless I feel ashamed to adopt the attitude of some responsible comrades at times—only criticizing the past mistakes of opportunism and excluding oneself. Whenever my comrades have pointed out my past opportunist errors, I earnestly acknowledged them. I am absolutely unwilling to ignore the experiences of the Chinese revolution obtained at the highest price paid by proletarians in the past (from the "August 7" conference to the present time, I not only did not reject proper criticism against me, but I even kept silent about the exaggerated accusations against me.)

Not only am I willing to acknowledge my past errors, but now or in the future, if I have or should have any opportunist errors in thought or action; likewise, I expect comrades to criticize me mercilessly with theoretical argument and fact. I humbly accept or shall accept all criticism but not rumors and false accusations. I cannot have such self-confidence as Chi-Chiu Bai and Lee Li San. I clearly recognize that it is never an easy thing for anybody or any party to avoid the errors of opportunism. Even such veteran Marxists as Kautsky and Plechanov committed unpardonable opportunism when they were old; those who followed Lenin for a long time like Stalin and Bucharin, are now also committing shameful opportunim; how can superficial Marxists like us be self-satisfied? Whenever a man is self-satisfied, he prevents himself from making progres.

Even the banner of the Opposition is not the incantation of the "Heavenly Teacher" Chang (the head of the Tao-ist religion who has the "power" of driving out devils). If those who have not fundamentally cleared out the ideology of the petty bourgeoisie, plainly understood the system of past opportunism and decisively participated in struggles, merely stand under the banner of the Opposition to revile the opportunism of Stalin and Lee Li San, and then think that the opportunist devils will never approach they are under an illusion. The only way of avoiding the errors of opportunism is continually and humbly to learn from the teachings of Marx and Lenin in the struggles of the proletarian masses and in the mutual criticism of comrades.

I decisively recognize that the objective cause of the failure of the last Chinese revoluton is second in importance, and that the chief point is that the error of opportunism is the error of our policy in dealing with the bourgeios Kuo Min Tang*. All the responsible comrades of the Central Committee at that time, especially myself, should openly and courageously recognize that this policy was undoubtedly wrong. But it is not enough merely to recognize the error. We must sincerely and thoroughly acknowledge that the past error was the internal content of the policy of opportunism, what were the causes and results of that policy, and reveal them clearly. Then we can hope to stop continuing the errors of the past, and the repetition of former opportunism in the next revolution. When our Party was first founded, though it was quite young, yet, under the guidance of the Leninist International, we did not commit any great mistakes. For instance, we decisively led the struggle of the workers and recognized the class nature of the Kuo Min Tang. In 1921, our Party induced the delegates of the Kuo Min Tang and other social organizations to participate in the Far Eastern Toilers' Conference, which was called by the Third International. The resolutions of the conference was that in the colonial countries of the East, the struggle for the democratic revolution must be carried out, and that in this revolution peasant Soviets should be organized.

In 1922, at the second conference of the Chinese Party the policy of the joint front in the democratic recolution was adopted, and based upon this we expressed our attitude towards the political situation. At the same time, the representative of the Young Communist International, Dalin, came to China and suggested to the Kuo Min Tang the policy of a joint front of the revolutionary groups. **The head of the Kuo Min Tang, Sun Yat Sen rigidly refused it only allowing the members of the Chinese Communist Party and the Youth League to join the Kuo Min Tang and obey it, denying any union beyond the Party.**

Soon after the adjournment of our Party conference the Communist International sent its delegate, Maring, to China inviting all the members of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party to hold a meeting at the West Lake of Hangchow, in Chekiang Province, at which he suggested to the Chinese Party that it join the Kuo Min Tang organization. He strongly contended **that the Kuo Min Tang was not a party of the bourgeoisie, but the joint party of various classes** and that the proletarian party should join it in order to improve this party and advance the revolution.

At that time, all the five members of the Central Committee of the Chinese C.P. —Lee-Shu Chang, Chang Teh Li, Tsai Ho Sung, Kan Chiun Yu and I—**unanimously opposed the proposal.** The chief reason was: To join the Kuo Min Tang was to confuse the class organizations and curb our independent policy. Finally, **the delegate of the Third International asked if the Chinese Party would obey the decision of the International.**

Thereupon, for the sake of respecting international discipline the Central Committee of the C.P.C. could not but accept the proposal of the III International and agree to join the Kuo Min Tang. After this, the international delegate and the representatives of the Chinese Party spent nearly a year to carry on the reorganization movement of the Kuo Min Tang. But from the very outset the Kuo Min Tang entirely neglected and refused it. Many times Sun Yat Sen said to the delegate of the International: **"So far the Chinese C P has joined the Kuo Min Tang; it should obey the discipline of the K M T and should not openly criticize it. If the Communists do not obey the Kuo Min Tang I shall expel them from it; if Soviet Russia stands on the side of the C P C I shall oppose Soviet Russia at once."**

At this period the Chinese Communists were not very much tainted with opportunism so that we could conduct the strike of the railroad workers on February 7, 1923, and the "May 30th" movement of 1925, since we were not hindered by the policy of the K.M.T. and at times severely criticized the compromising policy of the K.M.T. As soon as the proletariat raised its head in the "May 30th" movement, the bourgeoisie was immediately aroused.

At the enlarged conference of the Central Committee of the C.P., held in Peking in October of the same year, I submitted the following proposal to the Political Resolution Committee; Tai Chi Sao's pamphlets were not accidental but the indication that the bourgeoisie attempted to strengthen its own power for the purpose of checking the proletariat and going over to the counter-revolution. We should be ready immediately to withdraw from the Kuo Min Tang. We should maintain our political countenance, lead the masses and not be checked by the policy of the Kuo Min Tang. At that time both the delegate of the III International and the responsible comrades of the Central Committee unanimously opposed my suggestion, **saying that it was to propose to the comrades and the masses to take the path of opposing the Kuo Min Tang.** I, who had no decisiveness of character, could not insistently maintain my proposal and respect international discipline and the opinion of the majority of the Central Committee.

Chiang Kai-Shek's **coup d'Etat** on March 20, 1926 was made to carry out Tai Chi Sao's principles. Having arrested the Communists in large numbers, disarmed the guards of the strike committees of Canton and Hong Kong of the visiting Soviet Russian group (most of the members of this group were members of the Central Committee of the U. S. S. R.) and of the Soviet advisors, the Central Committtee of the Kuo Min Tang decided that **all Communist elements retire from the supreme party headquarters of the K.M.T., that criticism of Sun Yat Senism by Communists be prohibited, and that the list of the names of the members of the Communist Party and of the League, who joined the K M T be handed over to the latter. All these we accepted.**

At the same time we resolved to prepare our independent military forces in order to be equal to the forces of Chiang Kai-Shek. Comrade Peng Shu Chih was sent to Canton as representative of the Central Committee of the Chinese Party to consult the International delegate about our plan. **But the latter did not agree with us, and endeavored his best constantly to enforce Chiang Kai-Shek.** He rigidly advocated that we exhaust all our strength to support the military dictatorship of Chiang Kai-Shek. to strengthen the Canton government, and to carry on the Northern Expedition. We demanded that he take 5.000 rifles out of those given to Chiang Kai Shek and Lee Chi Shing, so that we might arm the peasants of Kwantung province. **He refused,** saying: "The armed peasants cannot fight with the forces of Chen Chuin Ming nor take part in the Northern Expedition, but **they can incur the suspicion of the Kuo Min Tang and make the peasants oppose it."**

This was a most critical period. Concretely speaking, it was the period when the bourgeois K.M.T. openly compelled the proletariat to follow its guidance and direction, that the proletariat was formally declared by us to surrender to the bourgeoisie, to follow it, and be willing to be subordinates of the bourgeoisie. (The international delegate said openly: **"The present period is a period in which the Communists should do the coolie service for the Kuo Min Tang."**) By this time, the Party was already not the party of the proletariat, having become completely the extreme Left wing of the bourgeoisie, and beginning to fall into the deep pit of opportunism.

After the **coup** of March 20, I stated in a report to the III International my personal opinion that cooperation with the Kuo Min Tang by means of joint work within it should be changed to cooperation outside the K.M.T. Otherwise, we would be unable to carry out our own independent policy or secure the confidence of the masses. After having read my report, the international put an article by Bucharin in **Pravda**, severely criticizng the Chinese Party on withdrawing from the Kuo Min Tang, saying: "There have been two mistakes: the advocacy of withdrawal from the yellow trade unions and from the Anglo-Russian Trade Union Committee; now the third mistake has been produced: the Chinese Party advocates withdrawal from the Kuo Min Tang." At the same time, the head of the Far Eastern Bureau, Wu Ting Kong was sent to China to correct your tendency to withdraw from the K.M.T. At that time, I again failed to maintain my proposal strongly. for the sake of honoring the discipline of the International and the opinion of the majority of the members of the Central Committee.

Later on, the Northern Expedition Army set out. We were very much persecuted by the K.M.T. because in **The Guide** we criticized the **curbing of the labor movement in the rear, and the compulsory collection of the military fund from the peasants** for the use of the Northern Expedition. In the meantime the workers in Shanghai were about to rise up to oust the Chihili-Shantung troops. If the uprising were successful, the problem of the ruling power would be posed. At that time. in the minutes of the political resolution of the Enlarged Conference of the Central Committee, I suggested:

The Chinese revolution has two roads: One is that it be led by the proletariat, then we can reach the goal of the revolution; the other is that it be led by the bourgeoisie, and thus the latter must betray the revolution on the road. And though we may cooperate with the bourgeoisie at the present we must nevertheless seize the leading power. However, all the members of the Far Eastern Bureau of the III International residing in Shanghai unanimously opposed my opinion. saying that such an opinion would influence our comrades to oppose the bourgeoisie too early. Further, they declared, **if the Shanghai uprising succeeds the ruling power should belong to the bourgeoisie and that it was unnecessary to have any delegates of the workers to participate.** At that time, I again could not maintain my opinion because of their criticism.

(To Be Continued)

The following document. originally entitled "Appeal to all the Comrades of the Chinese Communist Party", is of enormous importance to every revolutionary worker throughout the world. That is why the Militant has decided to publish it in full despite its length. The Stalin-Bucharin apparatus has for years suppressed the point of view of the Bolshevik Opposition on the Chinese revolution. With equal ruthlessness, it has sought to prevent the movement from knowing just how it destroyed the Chinese revolution with its Menshevik policies. The document by comrade Tchen is a contribution of primary importance towards clarifying the concealed points. It is interesting to observe that comrade Tchen was not only the founder and leader of the Chinese Party for years, but its secretary at the time of the 1925-27 revolution. As he relates he carried out the Stalin-Bucharin policies faithfully, and earned some very sharply critical remarks from Trotsky at that time. All the more significant now is his acknowledgement of the correctness of comrade Trotsky's viewpoint and criticism. The Chinese, the Indian—in fact, all the colonial and semi-colonial —revolutions cannot be understood today, or the correct policies adopted for their victory without unerstanding the yesterday. The Stalinists—for cause!—sought and still seek to conceal their disgraceful record of yesterday, and thus prevent progress for today and tomorrow. Comrade Tchen's document. on the contrary, helps make possible tomorrow's success. We urge all readers to follow it closely.—Ed.

---

* Stalin said: "Was the policy of the Bolsheviks in 1905 correct? Yes it was correct. But why did there exist Soviets and the correct policy of the Bolsheviks, but yet the 1905 revolution could not succeed? This was because the power of the feudal relics and the despotic government was stronger than that of the revolutionary movement. Cannot we say that the policy of the Chinese Communist Party has not improved the fighting power of the proletariat, made the relations between the proletariat and the broad masses more intimate, and increased the prestige of the proletariat among the masses? Very evidently, we cannot say so." The correct policy, of course, is not the only guarantee of success but erroneous policy is the chief guarantee of failure. If we think that the power of the enemy is stronger though there is a correct policy, and yet the revolution cannot succeed, then the failure of the Russian revolution in 1905 and the failure of the Chinese revolution in 1927 and all other failures of the workers' revolutionary movement, are pre-destined. I do not want to have Stalin defend the Chinese Party like this, and am even more unwilling to defend myself with Stalin's words.

A PILLAR OF STALINISM

One of the principal points of support of Stalinism in Czecho-Slovakia has been "comrade" Julo Vercik. He was a member of the Central Committee of the Party, Communist International and in that capacity one of the most fearless and consistent knights in the struggle against "counter-revolutionary Trotskyism," against Left dangers and Right dangers, or any other danger his employer told him to fight. His vigor in fighting against deviations from Stalinism was hardly exceeded by that of Browder or Harrison George. Now he has found a new master. The pillar of Stalinism has just shifted his membership to the . . . Social Democratic party of Czecho-Slovokia. If it isn't Bessedovosky, it's sure to be Vercik.

Subscribe to the Militant

Molotov's Prosperity in Knowledge

Among other pearls presented by Molotov to the Sixteenth Congress, there is the following thought, nay, a whole web of thoughts:

"It is worth recalling in this connection some of Trotsky's declarations made several years ago. Trotsky contended more than once, that 'since the imperialist war in Europe no development of the productive forces has been possible! (L. Trotsky, Europe and America, 1926), that to Europe's share remains only 'absolute stagnation and dismemberment' (L. Trotsky, Five Years of the Comintern). This did not prevent (!) the 'Left' Trotsky from becoming later on (!) the bard of American prosperity. In reality, his speeches about the fact that America would put Europe on 'rations' were a peculiar re-singing (?) of the theory of 'exceptionalism' which afterward (!) became the fundamental basis of the Right wing renegades in the American Communist Party. In this instance, too, Trotsky, under 'Left' phrases, dragged a thoroughly Right opportunist line hostile to the Comintern." (**Pravda,** July 8, 1930).

Please note the tenor of Molotov's thoughts. Trotsky contended several years ago that Europe is confronted with stagnation and decline. "This did not prevent the 'Left' Trotsky from becoming later on the bard of American prosperity." Why should this particularly have "prevented Trotsky?" Does Europe's stagnation exclude the development of America? On the contrary, it was precisely the growing might of the United States that I connected with Europe's stagnation. In one of the reports on this subject, I said:

"The unparalleled economic superiority of the United States, even independent of the conscious policy of the American bourgeoisie, will not permit the rise of European capitalism. American capitalism, driving Europe ever further into an impasse, will automatically drive it to the road of revolution. This contains the most important key to the world situation." (L. Trotsky, Europe and America, page 64).

What is the meaning of the socalled contradiction of which Molotov attempts to accuse me? It means that our accidental theoretician is always disposed to "enter with both feet" into some kind of a periodical mess.

Insofar as Europe is concerned, I was not alone in saying after the war that all the roads of development are closed to European capitalism—this same thought is expressed in all the basis document of the Comintern: in the manifesto of the Second Congress, in the programmatic thesis on tactics of the Third Congress, in the resolution of the Fourth Congress, and repeated by the Fifth Congress (when in some respects it was already incomplete). In the broad historical sense, this contention is true even today. If Europe's production is now about 113 percent of the pre-war figure, it means that the per-capita income of the adult population did not grow in the sixteen years, and for the toilers—it decreased. In the report to which Molotov refers, I said: "European capitalism has become reactionary in the absolute sense of the word, that is, not only does it not lead the nation forward but it is even incapable of retaining for it the standard of living it reached the past. This is the economic basis of the present revolutionary epoch. Political ebb and flow develop on this basis but do not change it." (Europe and America, page 72).

Or perhaps Molotov disputes this thought?

It is doubtless that Europe rose out of the destruction and decline of the first post-war years, and for the second time straightened out after the convulsions of the Ruhr occupation. This became possible, however, only because of the continuous chain of defeats of the European proletariat and the colonial movements. When, a day after the war, or in 1925, in foreseeing great social struggles in England or a revolutionary situation in China, we spoke of the inextricable position of European imperialism, we naturally made the point of departure in our calculations the victory of the proletariat, and not its defeat. At that time we did not really foresee the exploits of Stalin-Molotov in England, China, as well as in other countries. At any rate, not to their full extent. And there is no doubt—this is in no way a paradox—that Stalin and Molotov did more than all the statesmen of Europe to presevere and stabilize, to save European capitalism. Naturally, against their own will. But this does not improve matters.

What does it mean to be the "bard" of American prosperity? America has the advantage over Europe which a big monpoly trust has ever dispersed, middle and small enterprises competing among themselves. To point out this advantage and to reveal its tendencies, does not mean to become a "bard" of trusts. By the way, the petty bourgeois dough-heads more than once called the Marxists the "bards" of big capitalist enterprise.

Molotov, however, forgets that the Fifth Congress of the Comintern simply overlooked America, while the Sixth Congress included in the program a note on this same correlation of America and Europe which Stalin attempted so helplessly to deny. Molotov recalls the rations. Even this prognosis is borne out at every step. What is the Young plan if not a financial ration? And didn't America put the British Navy on a ration? This is only a beginning.

Molotov himself finally came to the thought, (or maybe he was prompted) that "by the Kellogg Pact, she (America) strives to make the decision of the question of the future imperialist war dependent upon its will," Even though not an original admission, nevertheless a valuable one. But this means precisely that America is striving (and in part succeeds) to put European imperialism on rations. By the way: if this is the objective significance of the Kellogg Pact—and this is just what it is—how it is that Stalin and Molotov dared to adhere to it?

In 1924, in the report on "Europe and America" (this is just the report Molotov has in mind) we said, in connection with the naval rivalry between the United States and Great Britain: "But we must add: when England's position becomes such that it must openly accept the American ration, it will not be done directly by Lord Curzon—he will not do, he is too proud —no, **this will be entrusted to MacDonald** . . . Here the pious eloquence of MacDonald, Henderson, the Fabians, will be required in order to press on the English bourgeoisie and persuade the English workers, 'What, then, shall we go to war with America? No, we are for pecae, for agreement.' And what does agreement with Uncle Sam mean? To go on rations —this is the only agreement, there is no other. And if you do not want to—then prepare for war." (L. Trotsky, Europe and America, page 30-31).

It so happens that in politics, no matter how artful, some things can be foreseen. Molotov very deeply despises such an occupation. He prefers not to see even what is happening before his very nose.

Further: why did Molotov drag in "prosperity"? In order to reveal his own education? We readily believe that after the designation of Molotov to the post of leader of the Comintern, tongues of flame came down to him, as happened at one time to the apostles, after which he immediately began to talk in unknown languages. But "prosperity" is nevertheless irrelevant. Prosperity has a conjunctural significance and means flourishing, in the sense of a commercial-industrial ascent. But my comparion of America and Europe was based upon fundamental economic indices (national wealth, income, mechanical power, coal, oil, metal, etc.) and not on the conjunctural fluctuations of those indices. Molotov evidently wants to say: Trotsky glorified the might of America, and yet, look, the United States is going through the most acute crisis. But does a crisis deny capitalist might? Didn't England, in the epoch of its world hegemony, know crises? Is capitalist development in general conceivable without crises? Here is what we said on this score in the Criticism of the Program of the Comintern:

"We cannot enter into a consideration of the problem of the time of the American crisis and its possible depth. This is not a question of program but of conjuncture. For us, of course, the inevitability of a crisis is absolutely unquestionable and, considering the present world expansion of American capitalism, its great depth and sharpness is not excluded. But the efforts to minimize or weaken the importance of North American hegemony on this ground is not justified by anything, and can only lead to most profound errors of a strategical character. On the contrary, in a critical epoch the hegemony of the United States will prove even more complete, more open, more ruthless, than in the period of boom. The United States will try to overcome and get out of its difficulties and helplessness primarily at the expense of Europe. . . ." (Page 10, American Edition).

Further on, we expressed regret that "this trend of thought has found absolutely no expression in the draft program of the Comintern" (Page 11).

It so happens that in economics as well as in politics—even to a greater extent than in politics—some things can be foreseen. But we already know: Molotov does not care for this frivolous occupation.

A few words remain to be said on the concluding part of the web of Molotov's thoughts: Trotsky's views in regard to America's placing Europe on rations were, don't you see, a "peculiar re-singing (?) of the theory of exceptionalism which afterwards (!) became the fundamental basis of the Right wing renegades in the American Communist Party." (What kind of a re-singing is that which comes before the melody itself? But let us not be severe with Molotov the orator and author: we are occupied here with the thinker).

The "Right wing renegades"—are Lovestone and Co., who, back, in 1924 were already tired of criticizing my views on the inter-relations of America and Europe. Here Molotov has actually given us nothing but a re-singing. The theory of exceptionalism, or peculiarities, was really given its most consummate and reactionary expresion by Stalin and Molotov who, in 1924, announced to the whole of humanity that **in contrast to all the other countries of the world,** the U. S. S. R. has the possibility of constructing socialism within its national boundaries. If we take into consideration that the whole historical mission of our Party is the construction of socialism, it may be said that from the viewpoint of this task the **exceptionalism** of the U. S. S. R. has according to Stalin, an absolute character. No matter what expectionalism was sought for the United States by Lovestone and Co., it could not be higher than the one Stalin secured for the U. S. S. R. by the decrees of the Comintern.

Further: Didn't the program of the Comintern nevertheless recognize the world capitalist hegemony of the United States? Neither Greece nor Belgium nor a number of other countries possess this "small" peculiarity. Aren't we therefore correct in saying that the world hegemony of the United States represents its **exceptional** peculiarity? Or perhaps Molotov has arrived at a refutation of the program of the Comintern which was written by Bucharin several months before he was declarcd a bourgeosis liberal?

"Trotsky drags an opportunist line under Left phrases." In what sense is the statement of the world domination of the United States a "phrase" and just why is it a "Left" phrase? It is quite impossible to understood anything. Instead of thoughts, —a sort of rotted chaff. No matter what you touch, it crumbles.

But the whole point is that after the Soviet Union is abstracted theoretically from the rest of humanity, Molotov demands that all the rest of the countries should give up pretensions at peculiarities, and even more, at expectionalism. And indeed, would it be easy to direct half a hundred Communist Parties if, relying upon peculiarities, they would refuse to step forward simultaneously with the Left foot at Molotov's command? After all, one must sympathize with a leader. . . .

In the article "Two Conceptions" (see **The Militant,** Vol III, No. 19 and 20), we showed in detail the whole inconsistency of Stalin's (and that means Molotov also) understanding of internationalism. The opportunism of Lovestone, Brandler and their partisans lies in the fact that they demand the recognition for themselves of those national socialist rights which Stalin considers a monopoly of the U. S. S. R. It is not for nothing that these gentlemen carried through the whole campaign against "Trotskyism" shoulder to shoulder with Molotov. And this campaign embraced, more or less, all the questions of Communist world outlook. Even now, Lovestone declares that what divides him from the Comintern leadership are tactical differences, but from the Left Opposition—besides tactical — also programmatic and theoretical differences. And this is absolutely true.

That America's position is exceptional will not be denied even by the valorous Czech soldier, Schwejk who, it is said, has become a fellow champion of Smeral. But Lovestone's national opportunism does not in the least flow from this exceptionalism. The basis of this opportunism is the program of the Comintern which speaks of the world hegemony of the United States, that is, of its exceptionalism, but does not draw any revolutionary conclusions because it does not speak of the inseparable bond between American "exceptionalism" and the "exceptionalism" of the other parts of the world. Here is what our criticism of the program says on this score:

"On the other hand, it has been left entirely unmentioned—and this is not the least important phase of the same world problem—that it is precisely the international strength of the United States and its unbridled expansion resulting from it, that compels it to include powder magazines throughout the world among the foundations of its structure—the antagonisms between the east and west, the class struggle in old Europe, uprisings of the colonial masses, wars and revolutions. This on the one hand transforms United States capitalism into the basis counter-revolutionary force in the present epoch, becoming constantly more interested in the maintenance of order in ever corner of the globe, and on the other hand prepares the ground for a gigantic revolutionary explosion of this already dominant and still increasing world imperialist power." (Page 9, American edition).

If Molotov does not agree with this, let him object. We are ready to learn. But instead of analytical objections, he presents us with his own declaration of his prosperity in knowledge, which has not, however, been proved as yet. And in general, it occurs to us that it is in vain that Molotov mortifies the flesh with knowledge. Even Ecclesiastes said: "He that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow." —T.

THE LATEST PAMPHLET BY COMRADE LEON TROTSKY

The Turn in the Communist International and the German Situation

A keen analysis of the latest turn in policy of the present leadership of the Communist International in connection with an examination of the results of the recent elections in Grmany. Comrade Trotsky reveals the relationship of forces between the proletariat, the big and small bourgeoisie, and their political parties, and presents the perspectives for the great dilemua in Germany: Communism or Fascism.

10 cents a copy : : 7 cents in bundles.

JUST WRITTEN : : JUST PUBLISHED

Order Now From
THE MILITANT
25 Third Avenue New York, N. Y.

STALIN AS A THEORETICIAN

By LEON TROTSKY

Ground Rent, or, Stalin Deepens Marx and Engels

In the beginning of his struggle against the "general secretary," Bucharin declared in some connection that Stalin's chief ambition is to compel his recognition as a "theoretician." Bucharin knows Stalin well enough, on the one hand, and the A B C of Communism, on the other, to understand the whole tragedy of this pretension. It was in the role of a theoretician that Stalin appeared at the conference of the Marxian agronomists. Among other things, **ground rent** did not come out unscathed.

Only very recently (1925) Stalin judged that it was necessary to strengthen the peasant holdings for scores of years, that is, the actual and juridical liquidation of the nationalization of the land. The People's Commissar of Agriculture of Georgia, not without the knowledge of Stalin, it is understood, at that time introduced a legislative project for the direct abolition of the nationalization. The Russian Commissar of Agriculture worked in the same spirit. The Opposition sounded the alarm. In its platform, it wrote: "The Party must give a crushing rebuff to all the tendencies directed towards the abolition or undermining of the nationalization of land, one of the pillars of the dictatorship of the proletariat." Just as in 1922 Stalin had to give up his attempts on the monopoly of foreign trade, in 1926 he had to give up the attempt on the nationalization of land, declaring that "he was not correctly understood."

After the proclamation of the Left course, Stalin not only became the defender of the nationalization of land, but he immediately accused the Opposition of not understanding the significance of this whole institution. Yesterday's nihilism towards nationalization was immediately converted into a fetichism. Marx's theory of ground rent was given a new administrative task: To justify Stalin's complete collectivization.

Here we must make a brief reference to theory. In his unfinished analysis on ground rent, Marx divides it into **absolute** and **differential.** Since the same human labor applied to different sections of the land yields different results, the surplus yield of the more fertile section will naturally be retained by the owner of the land. This is **differential** rent. But not one of the owners will give to a tenant free of charge even the worst section as long as there is a demand for it. In other words, from private ownership of land necessarily flows a certain minimum of ground rent, independent of the quality of the soil. This is what is called **absolute** rent. In conformity with this theory, the liquidation of private ownership of land leads to the liquidation of absolute ground rent. Only that rent remains which is determined by the quality of the land itself, or, to state it more correctly, by the application of human labor to land of different quality. There is no need to elucidate that differential rent is not a relationship fixed by the section itself, but changes with the method of exploiting the land. These brief reminders are needed by us in order to reveal the whole paltriness of Stalin's excursion into the realm of the theory of the nationalization of land.

Stalin begins by correcting and deepening Engels. This is not the first time with him. In 1926, Stalin explained to us that to Engels as well as to Marx the A B C law of the unequal development of capitalism was unknown, and precisely because of this they both rejected the theory of socialism in one country which, in opposition to them, was defended by Vollmar, the theoretical forerunner of Stalin.

The question of the nationalization of the land, more correctly, the insufficient understanding of this problem by the old man Engels, is apparently approached by Stalin with greater caution. But in reality — just as lightly. He quotes from Engels' work on the peasant question the famous phrase that we will in no way violate the will of the small peasant; on the contrary, we will in every way help him "in order to facilitate his transition into associations," that is, to collectivized agriculture. "We will try to give him as much time as possible to consider it on his own piece of land." These excellent words, known to every literate Marxist, give a clear and simple formula for the relation of the proletariat to the peasantry.

Confronted with the necessity of justifying complete collectivization on a frenzied scale, Stalin underlines the exceptional, the even, "at first glance, exaggerated" caution of Engels with regard to conducting the small peasant on the road of socialist agricultural economy. What was Engels guided by in his "exaggerated" caution? Stalin replies thus: "It is evident that his point of departure was the existence of private ownership of land, the fact that the peasant has his piece of land from which he, the peasant, will be parted with difficulty. Such is the peasantry in **capitalist countries,** where private ownership in land exists. It is understood that **here** (?) great caution is needed. Can it be said that here in the U. S. S. R. there is such a situation? No, it cannot be said. It cannot, because we have no private ownership of land which binds the peasant to his individual economy." Such are Stalin's observations. Can it be said that in these observations there is even a grain of sense? No, it cannot be said. Engels, it appears, had to be "cautious" because in the **bourgeois** countries private ownership of land exists. But Stalin needs no caution because we have established the nationalization of land. But did there not exist in bourgeois Russia private ownership of land alongside of the more archaic communal ownership? We did not acquire the nationalization of land ready made, we established it after the seizure of power. But Engels speaks about the policy the proletarian party will put into effect precisely **after** the seizure of power. What sense is there to Stalin's condescending explanation of Engels' indecision: The old man had to act in bourgeois countries where private ownership of land exists, while we were wise enough to abolish private ownership. But Engels recommends caution precisely after the seizure of power by the proletariat, consequently, after the abolition of private ownership of the means of production.

By contrasting the Soviet peasant policy with Engels' advice, Stalin confuses the question in the most ridiculous manner. Engels promised to give the small peasant time to think on his own piece of land before he decides to enter the collective. In this transitional period of the peasant's "deliberations," the workers' state, according to Engels, must separate the small peasant from the usurers, the tradesmen, etc., that is, to limit the exploiting tendencies of the Kulak. The Soviet policy in relation to the main, that is, the non-exploiting, mass of all the peasantry, had precisely this dual character in spite of all its vacillations. In spite of all the statistical clatterings the collectivization movement is now, in the thirteenth year of the seizure of power, really going through the first stages. To the overwhelming mass of the peasants, the dictatorship of the proletariat has thus given twelve years for deliberation. It is doubtful if Engels had in mind such a long period, and it is doubtful if such a long period will be needed in the advanced countries of the West where, with the high development of industry, it will be incomparably easier for the proletariat to prove to the peasant by **deed** all the advantages of collective agriculture. If we, only twelve years after the seizure of power by the proletariat, begin a wide movement, so far very primitive in content, and very unstable, towards collectivization, it is to be explained only by our poverty and backwardness, in spite of the fact that we have the land nationalized, which Engels presumably did not think of, or which the Western proletariat will presumably be unable to establish after the seizure of power. In this contasting of Russia with the West, and at the same Stalin with Engels, the idolization of the national backwardness is glaringly apparent.

But Stalin does not stop at this. He immediately supplements economic incoherence with theoretical. "Why," he asks his unfortunate auditors, "do we succeed so easily (! !) in demonstrating, under the condition of nationalized land the superiority (of collectives) over the small peasant economies? This is where the tremendous revolutionary significance of the Soviet agrarian laws lies, which abolished absolute rent . . . and which established the nationalization of land." And Stalin self-contentedly, and at the same time, reproachfully, asks: "Why is not this new (!?) argument utilized sufficiently by our agrarian theoreticians in their struggle against every bourgeois theory?" And here Stalin makes reference—the Marxian agronomists are recommended not to exchange glances, nor to blow their noses in confusion, and what is more, not to hide their heads under the table—to the third volume of "Capital" and to Marx's theory of ground rent. What heights did this theoretician have to ascend before plunging into the mire with his "new argument." According to Stalin, it would appear that the Western peasant is tied down to the land by nothing else than "absolute rent." And since we "destroyed" this monster, that in itself caused to disappear the mighty "power of the land" over the peasant, so grippingly depicted by Gleb Ouspensky, and by Balzac and Zola in France.

In the very first place, let us establish that **absolute rent was not abolished by us, but was nationalized, which is not one and the same thing.** Newmark valued the national wealth of Russia in 1914 at 140,000,000,000 gold rubles, including in the first place the price of all the land, that is, the capitalized rent of the whole country. If we should want to establish **now** the specific gravity of the natural wealth of the Soviet Union within the wealth of humanity, we would of course have to include the capitalized rent, differential as well as absolute.

All economic criteria, absolute rent included, are reduced to human labor. Under the conditions of market economy, rent is determined by that quantity of products which can be extracted by the owner of the land from the products of the labor applied to it. The owner of the land in the U. S. S. R. is the state. By that itself it is the bearer of the ground rent. As to the actual liquidation of absolute rent, we will be able to speak of that only after the socialization of the land all over our planet, that is, after the victory of the world revolution. But within national limits, if one man say so without insulting Stalin, not only socialism can not be constructed, but even absolute rent cannot be abolished.

This interesting theoretical question has a practical significance. Ground rent finds its expression on the world market in the price of agriculture products. Insofar as the Soviet government is an exporter of the latter—and with the intensification of agriculture grain exports will increase greatly—to that extent, armed with the monopoly of foreign trade, the Soviet government appears on the world market **as the owner of the land whose product it exports,** and consequently, in the price of these products the Soviet government realizes the ground rent concentrated in its hands. If the technique of our agriculture were not inferior to that of the capitalists, and at the same time the technique of our foreign trade, then precisely with us in the U. S. S. R. absolute rent would appear in its clearest and most concentrated form. This moment will have to acquire the greatest siginficance in the future under the planned direction of agriculture and export. If Stalin now brags of our **"abolition"** of absolute rent, instead of **realizing** it on the world market, then a temporary right to such bragging is given him by the present weakness of our agricultural export and the irrational character of our foreign trade, in which not only is absolute ground rent sunk without a trace, but many other things as well. This side of the matter, which has no direct relation to the collectivization of peasant economy, nevertheless shows us by one more example that the idolization of economic isolation and economic backwardness is one of the basic features of our national-socialist philosopher.

Let us return to the question of collectivization. According to Stalin it would appear that the Western peasant is attached to his piece of land by the tie of absolute rent. Every peasant's hen will laugh at his "new argument." Absolute rent is a purely capitalist category. Dispersed peasant economy can have a taste of absolute rent only under episodic circumstances of an exceptionally favorable market conjuncture, as existed, for instance, at the beginning of the war. The economic dictatorship of finance capital over the diffused village is expressed on the market in unequal exchange. The peasantry generally does not issue out of the universal "scissors" regime. In the prices of grain and agricultural products in general, the overwhelming mass of the small peasantry does not realize the labor power, let along the rent.

But if absolute rent, which Stalin so triumphantly "abolished," says decidedly nothing to the brain or heart of the small peasant, then differential rent, which Stalin so generously spared, has a great significance, precisely for the Western peasant. The tenant farmer holds on to his piece of land all the stronger the more he and his father spent strength and means to raise its fertility. This applies, by the way, and not only to the West but to the East, for instance, to China with its districts of intensified cultivation. Certain elements of the petty conservation of private ownership are inherent here, consequently, not in an abstract category of absolute rent, but in the material conditions of a higher parcellized culture. If it is comparatively easy to break the Russian peasants away from a piece of land, it is not at all because Stalin's "new argument" liberated them from absolute rent but for the very reason for which, prior to the October revolution, periodic repartition of land took place in Russia. Our Narodniki idolized these repartitions as such. Nevertheless, they were only possible because of our non-intensive economy, the three-field system, the miserable tilling of the soil, that is, once again, because of the backwardness idolized by Stalin.

Will it be more difficult for the victorious proletariat of the West to eliminate peasant conservation which flows from the greater cultivation of small holdings? By no means. For there, because of the incomparably higher state of industry and culture in general, the proletarian state will more easily be enabled to give the peasant entering collective farms an evident and genuine compensation for his loss of the "differential rent" on his piece of land. There can be no doubt that twelve years after the seizure of power the collectivization of agriculture in Germany, England or America will be immeasurably higher and firmer than ours.

Is it not strange that his "new argument" in favor of complete collectivization was discovered by Stalin twelve years after nationalization had taken place? Then why did he, in spite of the existence of nationalization in 1923-1928 so stubbornly rely upon the powerful individual producer and not upon the collectives? It is clear: Nationalization of the land is a necessary condition for socialist agriculture but it is altogether insufficient. From the narrow economic point of view, that is, the one from which Stalin tackles the question, the nationalization of land is precisely of third rate significance, because the cost of inventory required for rational, large scale economy exceeds manifold the absolute rent.

Needless to say that nationalization of land is a necessary and most important political and juridical pre-condition for socialist reconstruction of agriculture. But the **direct** economic significance of nationalization at any given moment is determined by the action of factors of a material-productive character.

(To Be Continued)

N. Y. OPEN FORUM

EVERY SATURDAY NIGHT

Nov. 22: Thirteen Years of the Russian Revolution
—JAMES P. CANNON

Nov. 29: Unemployment and Revolutionary Tactics
—MAX SHACHTMAN

Dec. 6: Prospects for the New Unionism
—JAMES P. CANNON

at the Labor Temple
14th Street and Second Avenue

All Invited : : : : : Admission 25c

Auspices: New York branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition).

Young Vanguard

The Struggle of the Plumbers Helpers

In 1927, while carrying on the fight for recognition and affiliation of the plumbers helpers to the United Association of Plumbers and Steam Fitters, a section of the A. F. of L., a fight absolutely necessary in their struggle for organization, it was well known that it was led by a militant body with a Left wing program. There is no question that the A. F. of L. bureaucrats were well aware of this. It is one of the main reasons why they did not yield when it came to the question of recognition.

The plumbers helpers as a body began to acquaint themselves with the class struggle and the Left wing movement through their own participation in the conflict, through trade union classes, and their own organ, the **American Plumbers Helper.**

A Militant Policy

At all the meetings, classes and in all the propaganda carried on within the organization, a definite and set policy was at all times directed towards unity with the plumbers and the rest of the building trades, and affiliation to the "mother" body of journeymen. This policy, which was and is correct, was a stepping stone of the organization.

During this period of organization which was carried on by the A. A. of P. H., much contact was established with the Left wing movement, participation as a mass organization (not as a mere group) at various conferences, not only morally assisting, but also financially at times. One can say that the organization was a militant one fighting for principles of working class unionism.

With the loss of the strike and mistakes committed by the Young Communist League, the organization began to decline. When the dwindling away of the forces of the helpers began there was absolutely nothing done to save an excellent organization from decay.

There was a great opportunity to rally the helpers to battle when the 5-day week was instituted in the building trades in August 1929, which meant that the wages of the helpers decreased from $22 to $20 a week, causing many a spontaneous strike which occurred with no effect, because there was no organization to take advantage of such struggles. Admitting that certain factors were not ripe, yet nothing was done by the Left wing group of plumbers helpers within the Y. C. L. due to a number of reasons, one of which was the fear of allowing three young Opposition sympathizers, who were active among the helpers, to gain prestige among their fellow workers.

Due to a strike on the job in January 1930, the helpers again started to organize with eight numbers at the outset. This organization, the United Association of Plumbers Helpers, has 160 members today. With the beginning of this new helpers organization, the definite aim was pushed to the foreground by the helpers who were in the last union, to organize the trade, to carry on with the slogans which these workers had learned were correct. A series of immediate demands were adopted, calling for a living wage, organization with the adult group, double time for overtime, a chance to learn the trade, etc.

The Y. C. L. "Appears"

The Y. C. L., hearing of this revival, set to work by sending in a few ex-plumber helpers to "capture" the organization and model it according to the new "period." A "trade union" fight was incorrect at this time, according to them, an Industrial Pipe League was needed; affiliation to the United Association was wrong, to the T. U. U. L. was right, etc., etc.

In 1927, the T. U. E. L. carried on much activity within Right and Left wing unions through the various industrial groups of Left wingers. There is no question that the guidance and participation of the T. U. E. L. led to many a gain and victory for the workers. Yet the T.U.E.L. was not known to the plumbers helpers, not a single mention by any of the leading members of the organization was ever made of the T. U. E. L., and in fact, it did not bother the leaders of the T. U. E. L. whether there was such an organization of 3,500 helpers fighting for a union, or not.

Today, it is just the reverse. When the helpers are beginning to organize they must be stamped all over with "T. U. U. L.", must accept as gospel truth every word of the self-appointed leaders who are giving mis-guidance to the Left wing movement, otherwise they are only "aiding the labor fakers."

Union plumbers, with whom the helpers must unite, as well as other building trades crafts, still belong to the A. F. of L. ad have a craft ideology. Yet by merely saying to them, "Leave your organization and join the revolutionary unions," would have no impression whatsoever upon them.

Still, there is considerable opposition to the bureaucratic leaders of these trades unions, who should be combatted with a concentrated struggle to uphold union conditions and union traditions within the organizations.

A fight for the relief of the unemployed by shortening hours, by unemployment benefits, for 100 percent unionization of the job, amalgamation and other immediate demands, will not only bring the plumbers but also the other building workers into effective struggle for better conditions for themselves.

The plumbers helpers, if they are to organize effectively, must stress these very things, connect their struggle for organization with the every-day struggle of the building trades workers and act as pacesetters in the fight for militant unionism.

—J. SPRAGUE.

National Youth Committee

Several weeks ago, the national committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition) elected a national youth committee to aid comrade Albert Glotzer, youth representative on N. C. to carry on youth activity. The national youth committee wherever feasible will form youth committees or youth sections of the branches of the League. Definite steps are to be taken for the organization of a functioning faction in the official Y. C. L. Wherever possible, as for example, in New York City, independent youth activity will be conducted side by side with the struggle against the false policies and leadership of the Communist Youth League. Efforts will be made to expand the **Young Vanguard** as the voice of the Communist Opposition Youth.

At present the committee is working on a statement which is to be issued in its name to the coming National Convention of the Y. C. L. This statement will also serve as a basis for a youth platform for the coming conference of our organization.

Branch secretaries or comrades responsible for youth work, are asked to send in reports of activities to the national youth committee (care of national office). Youth comrades should also write articles for the **Young Vanguard.**

Help the Militant to return to a weekly by getting subscriptions. Two dollars puts you on our mailing list for a year.

The Peasants' International and the Anti-Imperialist League

What is doing with the Peasants' International? It was created by the epigones for the special purpose of showing how people who correctly evaluate the peasantry carry on politics. From the very outset, we considered that the whole contrivance is dead and insofar as it is not dead—it is reactionary. At the Sixth Congress, Bucharin made excuses for the fact that he could not report anything (that is, anything good) about the Peasants' International. He extended an invitation to engage in "helping the Peasants' International to be transformed into a real, live organization." At the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Molotov, in his report, did not as much as mention the Peasants' International by a single word, just as if it had not existed. Does it mean that there was no success in transforming it into a "live organization?" But this was one of the biggest fruits of anti-Trotskyism!

The peasantry is the least international of all the classes in bourgeois society. A peasants' international is a contradiction within itself, not a dialectical but a bureaucratic one. An independent international union of the peasantry outside of the national sections of the Comintern is—we repeat again—either a dead swivel chair invention or a hothouse of bourgeois democratic careerism under camouflage. The Peasants' International should be openly liquidated, drawing from it all the necessary conclusions.

It is worth noting that under the cover of the Peasants' International, work is the village has been almost completely reduced to zero. At the Sixth Congress, Bucharin was forced to admit: "In the peasant districts our influence did not grow but rather declined, and at that, in France as well as in Germany." This took place because "we" approached the peasantry from the viewpoint of the Peasants' International, that is astronomically. In reality, it was transformed into a hunt after the petty property owner as a property owner. The farm laborer and the semi-proletarian peasant were side-tracked. As a result—the weakening of Communism in the village. Molotov, in his report, passed over the work in the village in complete silence.

The Anti-Imperialist League is only a translation of the Peasants' International into the colonial language. Its conferences and work have had a purely decorative character. Munzenberg illustrated with Bengal lights the Left careerists of the Second International and tomorrow's executioners of the toiling masses in the colonies. The Bengalese illumination cost not a little, and left behind it an acrid odor and smoke under the cover of which the careerists, adventurers and candidates for executioners were accomplishing their deeds.

Let us not forget that the friendship of the Stalinists for the Kuo Min Tang flowed parallel with their intimate block with the strikebreakers of the General Council of the British Trade Unions, and that both these amities were tied into a knot with the Anti-imperialist League.

In the beginning of 1927, Munzenberg, the impresario of all the rotten and pompous performances, called together a congress of the League at Brussels. On this occasion, the central organ of the Comintern wrote, on February 25, 1927:

"It is no accident that the most active, inspiring (!) and leading role at the congress was played by the main active factors in the Chinese revolution: the Chinese trade unions, the Kuo Min Tang and the People's-Revolutionary army—on the one hand, and the representatives of the British proletariat, to whose share fell the central role of blowing up the intervention—on the other hand." (**Communist International,** 1927, No. 8, page 5).

"No accident!" It is no accident that at the Brussels conference the "inspiring" role was played by Chiang Kai-Shek's Kuo Min Tang, and the dear allies of the Anglo-Russian Committee!

The Anti-Imperalist League is a reserve Kuo Min Tangism on an international scale. The liquidation of the League, as well as of the Peasants' International is an unpostponable measure of revolutionary purification.

Opposition Group in Bulgaria

The International Secretariat of the Left Opposition informs us:

On October 19, 1930, a group of former members of the Bulgarian Communist Party (legal and illegal) adopted a resolution approving a manifesto issued by a group of Bulgarian comrades recently, which gives a Marxist evaluation of the revolutionary labor movement in the country, the situation in the international Communist movement, and condemning the theory and practises of the "third period." These comrades decided, further, to

> "constitute themselves into a central Marxist workers' group 'Osvobojdenie', taking as their base the ideas of the Manifesto of the International Left Opposition."

The resolution also sends its revolutionary greetings to the victims of the bourgeois repression in Bulgaria and all other countries, and to the valiant comrades of the Bolshevik-Leninist Opposition in the Soviet Union and its leaders, comrades Trotsky and Rakovsky.

garia marks another forward step of the

The formation of this group in Bul-Left Opposition in a country where the collapse of the Centrist leadership has virtually stripped the movement of its power. The Bulgarian Opposition group is the second to be constituted in the Balkans, the first being the Left wing group in Greece. Our hearty salute and wishes for victory!

A Plan

For You to Study

This announcement is not intended for a certain type of "practical people." We mean the kind who always excuse the fact that they do not read and study the problems of the working class movement with the argument that they are "too busy doing practical work." Now, practical work is the life's blood of the revolutionary movement. But unless it proceeds from a clear understanding of fundamental principles, unless it is motivated by correct theories, it is just so much barrel thumping: lots of noise but no content. It is our misfortune that this sort of "practical work" (in reality, it is highly impractical) is all too prevalent in the revolutionary movement. So if you are that kind of a "practical" person, don't listen in on this!

We started out with a plan. In our files, we had assembled a pile of material by comrade Trotsky—articles, documents, pamphlets and books—as tall as your leg. Their very publication would be one of the most smashing blows ever dealt to Stalinist opportunist and falsification. A reading of them would advance the Communist movement immeasurably, for they deal with the fundamental problems of the Russian and international revolution from the Marxist standpoint. They are documents suppressed in the literal sense of the word.

But since our paltry income hardly enables us to publish even the Militant, we could not print these works. That's where our plan came in. We believed we could get small groups of comrades to sponsor these publications. That is, a group of militants would donate the money for a special fund to print this or that work by Trotsky. And the plan has met with enthusiastic response and has already borne fruit. The pamphlet on "The Turn in the Comintern and the German Situation" was sponsored by six comrades: Harry Milton, Sol Sarachik, Sylvia Bleeker, Fred Berensmeier, Peter Keppel and Kurt Ahrens. Their donations enabled us to publish it before anyone else in the world and to publish it at a low price.

Now we have another work coming off the press (it will be ready a week after this issue of the Militant appears on the stands). Four comrades: Max Engel, Philip Shulman, Martin Abern and Morris Lewit, gave the contributions that are making it possible to publish this booklet at a popular price. It is "The Strategy of the World Revolution", a masterful analysis of the strategy and tactics of Bolshevism and a criticism of the course of the Stalin-Bucharin leadership since 1923. You will want to read this 100-page booklet, the manuscript of which had to be smuggled out of Russia, because no worker can call himself informed on the great dispute in the movement unless he has read it.

The "sponsorship plan" enables us to sell it at 25 cents a copy, and at 18 cents if you take a bundle of 5 or more (all postpaid). Our editions are limited in number, and you'd better order quickly. It's the kind of a work that shapes the movement, as it was shaped by the gifted contributions of Lenin and Trotsky in the early days of the Comintern.

And by the way, the plan is catching hold! Toronto comrades write in that they would like to be sponsors for another pamphlet, and we don't propose to turn them down. Quite the contrary: we want more. We have on hand enough pamphlets and books to keep our sponsors going for a long time. There Trotsky's pamphlet on "World Unemployment and the Five Year Plan", a section of which the Militant already printed (that was only a taste of what's to appear). Then there is his great work on "The Permanent Revolution" recently written and being translated now. You've heard Stalinists of all shades fulminate against "Trotsky's permanent revolution", but they never told you what the theory really looks like! Well, here it is—a smashing refutation of all the critics of this Marxist theory, and an eye-opening analysis of its relation to Lenin's conception of the Russian and international revolution.

If you're interested (we don't mean only groups of the Opposition, but sympathizers as well) in our plan to publish the Marxist literature of the day at popular prices, drop us a line and we'll let you know the details. But in the meantime, don't wait a minute to place your orders for

"THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION"
by Leon Trotsky.